

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,248  
Docket No.: 9174-US-PA

### REMARKS

#### Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori (US 6,078,318) in view of Nemiroff (US 6,195,393).

Applicant has amended claim 1 and newly added claims 12-15 to more clearly define the present invention. The limitation added in claim 1 is described in paragraph [0017] and the limitations added in claims 12-15 are described in paragraphs [0020], [0021], [0024] and [0025], and no new matter is entered. After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-4 and 12-13 remain pending in the present application, and reconsideration of those claims is respectfully requested. Claims 8-11 and 14-15 directly or indirectly depending to claim 1 are withdrawn in response to the previously restriction requirement. Currently, claim 1 is a generic claim. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all of the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

#### Rejection under 35 U.S.C 103 (a)

*Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-4 under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mori (US 6,078,318) in view of Nemiroff (US 6,195,393) because a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the Office Action.*

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), each of three requirements must be met. First, the reference or references, taken alone or combined, must teach

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,248  
Docket No.: 9174-US-PA

or suggest each and every element in the claims. Second, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the references in a manner resulting in the claimed invention. Third, a reasonable expectation of success must exist. Moreover, each of the three requirements must "be found in the prior art, and not be based on applicant's disclosure." See M.P.E.P. 2143, 8<sup>th</sup> ed., February 2003.

The present invention is in general related a noise suppressing method as claim 1 recites:

Claim 1. A noise suppressing method for a flat panel display driven by a time controller and a plurality of driver IC's, the noise suppressing method comprising:  
providing a signal detect circuit and a video signal processor; and  
*detecting whether a signal input to the flat panel display is stable by the signal detect circuit when the flat panel display is switched-on, and when the signal is unstable, controlling the driver IC's to output a black burst signal by the video signal processor.*

The office action stated Mori does not specifically detecting whether a signal input to the flat panel display is stable by the signal detect circuit, and when the signal is unstable, controlling the driver IC's to output a black burst signal by the video signal processor. Nemiroff is cited to teach display control device comprises detecting when the signal is unstable, the control circuit would output a black burst signal by the video signal processor. However, applicant respectfully submits Nemiroff fails to teach "detecting whether a signal input to the flat panel display is stable by the signal detect circuit *when the flat panel display is switched-on*, and when the signal is unstable, controlling the driver IC's to output a black burst signal by the video signal processor". Therefore, the two references (Mori and Nemiroff) combined do not teach each and every element in claim 1.

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,248  
Docket No.: 9174-US-PA

In particular, in the Nemiroff reference, Nemiroff discloses the invention relates to a method and apparatus for processing a sequent of video or other data frame at a data encoder *during a synchronization (sync) loss* (see col. 1, lines 6-8). Nemiroff also explains "sync loss" at col. 1, lines 47-54, that is a sync loss may be experienced at the video encoder due to a number of factors. For example, a change in data source, e.g., from a live television broadcast to a pre-recorded movie, may result in a sync loss, thereby casing undesired visible or other artifacts in the transmitted data stream. Additionally, a data dropout due to a defect in a data storage medium or noise in a transmission channel may result in a sync loss. Fig. 4 of the Nemiroff reference shows a process flow *during a sync loss* (col. 7, lines 50-51), and the step of 406 in Fig. 4 of outputting black burst signal by the video signal processor is performed during a sync loss. For the foregoing, the method disclosed by Nemiroff is used during a sync loss. Nemiroff does not teach "detecting whether a signal input to the flat panel display is stable by the signal detect circuit when the flat panel display is switched-on, and when the signal is unstable, controlling the driver IC's to output a black burst signal by the video signal processor".

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits the references combined do not teach or suggest each and every element claim 1, and thus a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the Office Action. Independent claim 1 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 2-4 patently define over the prior art as a matter of law, for at least the reason that these dependent claims contain all features of their respective independent claim.

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,248  
Docket No.: 9174-US-PA

**Newly added claims**

Applicant has newly added claims 12-13 that are depending claims of claim 1. Mori and Nemiroff do not teach the features as claims 12-13 recite. Applicant also newly added claims 14-15 which depending to claim 8. Claims 8-11 and 14-15 directly or indirectly depending to claim 1 are withdrawn in response to the previously restriction requirement. Currently, claim 1 is a generic claim. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all of the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/604,248  
Docket No.: 9174-US-PA

### CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: *June 1, 2006*

Respectfully submitted,

*Belinda Lee*  
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jiang Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: [belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw](mailto:belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw)  
[Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw](mailto:Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw)